

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13 and 21 have been rewritten. Claims 26-29 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Response to Applicant's previous arguments

In the Response to the Office Action submitted to the USPTO on April 24, 2006, a more detailed traversal was submitted. In the Response to Applicant's Arguments section in the instant Office Action, only the traverse to Claims 1, 5, and 23-25 were discussed. Once again, the Examiner has not included rejections germane to other Claims 2-4 and 6-12, which Applicant has specifically rebutted. Further, no detailed grounds for rejection have been specified for at least Claims 9-12, 18-20, and 22. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide specifics of where elements recited in Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22 may be found in the cited references so that Applicant has an adequate rebuttal opportunity.

Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Krupka et al. (U.S. Patent 5,483,467; "Krupka"), and Claims 5-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Krupka in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,583,874). Applicant traverses the rejections.

Anticipation standard

A prima facie case of anticipation has not been established. To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose every element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131 et seq.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a revision system that comprises, *inter alia*, data ports, local system ports, and visual indicators. When one of the data ports is placed in communication with one of the local system ports, a visual indicator corresponding to the data port may display information about the data port. At least a first of the visual indicators is disposed in physical proximity to a

first data port and at least a second of the visual indicators is disposed in physical proximity to a second data port.

Krupka in col. 1, lines 53-58, for example, teaches an apparatus for identifying the existence of signal paths along conductors between ports (scanner 30), and an output apparatus (main computer 10) coupled to the identifying apparatus through LAN cabling 14. The output apparatus provides an output indication of a connection pattern of the system. Throughout the text, the only specifics of this output apparatus are provided in passages such as those of col. 6, lines 62-65, in which Krupka states that, “[t]he scanner 30 may provide an interconnection status output to computer 10 or to any other computer or display in the system, including, for example, a dedicated output device” (emphasis added). Thus, Krupka teaches only that a lone output device displays an indication of the connection pattern determined by the scanner 30.

Nowhere does Krupka disclose that multiple visual indicators are present. Nor does Krupka specifically teach an arrangement in which, of the multiple visual indicators, at least one visual indicator corresponds to a different data port than another visual indicator, as recited in Claim 1.

Further, Krupka does not disclose the physical location of the output device. Nor does Krupka disclose the relationship between the physical location of the output device and the ports. Claim 1, to the contrary, recites that each visual indicator is disposed physically proximate to a corresponding data port.

In particular, while the Examiner states that Krupka discloses the physical location of the output device relative to the ports, in actuality the only thing the passage cited by the Examiner indicates is that scanner 30 is connected to main computer 10 via LAN 14. Merely stating that certain electronic elements are electrically connected together, however, is no indication of the physical locations of these elements. At best, the lone sentence relied upon by the Examiner at col. 6, lines 62-65 is ambiguous as to the positioning of computer 10 with respect to scanner 30. It is well settled that an anticipation rejection cannot be predicated on an ambiguous reference (In re Turlay, 304 F.2d 893, 899 134 USPQ 355, 360(CCPA 1962)). Thus, Krupka does not specifically anticipate or disclose an arrangement in which a visual indicator is disposed physically proximate to a corresponding data port.

Moreover, the Examiner states that Krupka discloses “outputting or displaying the interconnection status to computer 10 or to any other computer or display (e.g. desktops on rolling carts, laptops), which may be ‘disposed proximately’ to the patch panels to assist the network administrators in troubleshooting possible network problems.” However, Krupka does not explicitly disclose such an arrangement. More specifically, nowhere does Krupka discuss the use of laptops or desktops on rolling carts, let alone placing such “laptops or desktops on rolling carts” in physical proximity to the patch panel.

Accordingly, for both of these reasons, Applicant submits that a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Krupka does not anticipate or disclose the arrangement of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Previously, Applicants described the relative benefits of limited scans/analysis of the system compared to overall scans/analysis of the system. The Advisory Action stated that “it is unclear how an ‘analysis of the scan results’ is able to reduce the time delay. If anything, an analysis of the results would further delay the system and not ‘reduce’ as the Applicants argued.” Accordingly, Applicant herein reiterates his explanation.

Krupka discloses an arrangement in which scanner 30 automatically and continuously senses the interconnection arrangement of the patching cables, and thus senses the interconnection status of the various computer ports 16 and user ports 20. This is normal operation of the system, in which a full scan and full comparative analysis of all of the ports is repeated at each polling such that the entire configuration is determined at each polling. The new polling results are then compared to an immediately previous polling to determine the configuration change. This process may be lengthy and thus cause significant delay between successive pollings. During a reconfiguration, the full scan and comparative analysis may add significant time to the reconfiguration process because the revisor waits for the system to complete a full scan and analysis to confirm that each configuration change completed is correct.

In one embodiment of the instant apparatus (recited in Claim 26), however, a specialized targeted scan or analysis of scan results is used during reconfiguration. The targeting may focus on particular results, e.g. only analysis of the information module port or system port and any ports corresponding to illuminated lights (activated output indicators). The targeting thus may

sense only configurational changes during the revision process, rather than executing a full scan and analysis as in the normal operation of Krupka.

In this embodiment, the targeting may reduce the time delay while permitting confirmation of the changes made as only a small fraction of the time delay necessitated by a full scanning and analysis process is used. This may increase the efficiency of the reconfiguration in computational power, as well as time spent by the revisor. Accordingly, the targeted scan/analysis of Claim 26 is faster than the full scan/analysis of Krupka.

Claim 5

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, a revision system comprising data ports and a portable information module that is connectable to a local system port. When the portable information module is connected to a local system port, the portable information module may be placed into communication with and display information about a particular data port. Pairs of the data ports are connectable to place the pairs into communication with each other.

Krupka does not anticipate or suggest such a system. Accordingly, the Examiner relies on Smith to remedy this deficiency.

Although Applicant traversed the rejection in response to the previous Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Smith teaches connecting the tester, through the hub jack, to any particular wall jack (i.e. the local system jack) via a cable to test the connection between the hub and the particular wall jack. The Examiner further reasoned that if there were a connection, or lack thereof, the tester would alert the network administrator of a possible network connection problem between the hub and the particular wall jack.

Smith discloses a portable tester for LANs. To test the status of a hub 10, cable 14 is connected between the hub and a hub jack 40 of the tester and a “push to test” switch 50 pressed (col. 3, lines 52-55). Thus, in this case, the tester tests the hub 10 and cable 14. To test a network interface card 28 of a PC 16, cable 32 is connected between the PC and a PC jack 38 on the hub and the push to test switch 50 pressed (col. 3, lines 62-66). In particular, the tester generates pulses to cause a PC connected to the PC jack to think it is connected to a hub and to send data packets intended for the hub to the tester or to cause a hub connected to the hub jack to think it is connected to a PC and to send data packets intended for the PC to the tester.

Despite the assertion that Smith teaches connecting the tester, through the hub jack, to any particular wall jack (i.e. the local system jack) via a cable to test the connection between the hub and the particular wall jack, Smith in reality does not teach such an arrangement. Rather Smith teaches connecting the tester 36, through the hub jack 40, to a cable 14 connected to the hub 10 (col. 3, lines 52-55). Furthermore, in col. 3, lines 36-40, Smith states that, “it will not usually be clear to the user whether the problem is in their network interface card such as cards 28 and 30, the cables 32 and 34, the link 14, or the hub 10.” Nowhere does Smith disclose that a problem might appear in wall jack 24. Nor does Smith disclose that the cable to the hub is connected to the tester specifically through the wall jack.

However, even if the wall jack is disposed between the tester and the hub during testing of the hub, Claim 5 also recites that:

- a) pairs of the data ports are connectable to place the pairs into communication with each other;
- b) local system ports are in communication with a computer processor; and
- c) the portable information module is connectable to a local system port.

Smith, on the other hand, teaches that only the hub OR the PC can be tested at one time when using the portable link tester; that is, Smith teaches that the hub and PC are disconnected during testing. As Smith makes clear, e.g. in the Abstract and Summary, under no circumstances are the hub and PC simultaneously connected together when the tester is used. Thus, assuming, *arguendo*, that a wall jack is a system port, Smith does not disclose the simultaneous connections of: a wall jack to a computer processor; pairs of data ports together; and the tester to the wall jack.

As above, Smith discloses testing of the hub and cabling to the hub or testing of the PC and cabling to the PC at different times. However, Smith does not disclose pairs of data ports, how data ports are connected to the system ports, or how connection to a system port leads to testing of a data port.

Nor does incorporating the arrangement of Krupka provide these features. If the arrangements of Krupka and Smith were combined, the tester would be connected to the wall jack (system port according to the Examiner) to test the link between the tester and the hub, but there is no indication of how this connection is used to specifically display information about a data port. Accordingly, neither Krupka and Smith teach an arrangement in which, when the portable

information module is connected to a *local system port*, the portable information module may be placed into communication with and display information about a particular data port.

For at least these reasons, neither Krupka nor Smith, alone or in combination, anticipate or suggest the arrangement of Claim 5. Accordingly, Claim 5 is patentable over the cited references.

Other Claims

Claims 13 and 21 have been rewritten to incorporate limitations similar to those of Claim 5. Accordingly, Claims 13 and 21 are patentable over the cited references for at least the above reasons pertaining to Claim 5.

Regarding Claims 23-25, the Examiner states that Krupka discloses all of the elements of each of these claims excepting a portable information module. Each of these claims recites port plates, in addition to data ports and local system ports. The claims recite that each port plate corresponds to a data port. The Examiner does not specifically point out where port plates are disclosed in Krupka, merely stating that they are shown in Fig. 1A. Applicant respectfully requests that, if the Examiner continues his contention, the Examiner specifically point out where such port plates are located in this figure.

Moreover, each claim recites further features of the system in relation to the port plates. Claim 23 recites that: (1) one or more visual indicators correspond to and are disposed proximately to each of a number of port plates; and (2) the visual indicator corresponding to the port plate displays information about the port plate when the port plate is placed in communication with a local system port. Claim 24 recites that the portable information module may be placed into communication with and display information about different port plates. Claim 25 recites similar limitations regarding port plates. Krupka does not disclose arrangements with such features. Applicant respectfully requests that, if the Examiner continues his contention that Fig. 1A illustrates such features, the Examiner specifically point out where in Fig. 1A such features can be found, along with the corresponding text in Krupka.

For at least these additional reasons, Claims 23-25 are patentable over the cited references.

Although no further arguments are required for dependent Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22, Applicant submits that at least some of the elements in these claims are neither anticipated nor suggested by the cited references. For example, none of the cited references anticipate or suggest

arrangements in which: the scanner polls at least the data port connected to the portable information module *upon connection* of the portable information module with the connected data port (Claim 9); at least one of the data ports includes a port plate disposed proximately thereto (Claims 10, 18, 22); one of the data ports includes a patch cord plug inserted therein, the patch cord plug disposed at an end of the patch cord and including a plug extension for contacting the port plate when the patch cord plug is inserted in the data port (Claims 11, 19); or the patch cord plug includes a plug plate thereon, the plug plate being connectable to the portable information module (Claims 12, 20). In fact, none of the Office Actions has even mentioned these elements or specified where in Krupka such elements may be found.

Moreover, although the Office Action asserts that Krupka discloses the arrangement of Claim 7, which recites specifics of a second portable information module, Applicant traverses this rejection. As the rejection of Claim 5, the independent claim upon which Claim 7 is based, indicates, Krupka does not disclose a portable information module. Accordingly, the specific lines noted in the Office Action regarding Krupka have no bearing on such a feature. Further, although Smith is used to provide a portable information module, nowhere does Smith teach an arrangement with multiple portable information modules, let alone an arrangement in which both modules are able to function simultaneously.

Note that the above is merely exemplary as an incomplete listing of claims for which the cited references do not anticipate or suggest the elements.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22 are independently patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be desirable to clear up further issues, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number below. No fees are believed to be due with the submission of this response, but the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deemed necessary, except the issue fee, to deposit account number 16-0228.

Dated: July 24, 2006

Panduit Corp.
Legal Department - TP12
17301 S. Ridgeland Avenue
Tinley Park, Illinois 60477-3091
(708) 532-1800, Ext. 1369

Customer No. 32915

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'AP Curtis', written over a horizontal line.

Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,193
Attorney for Applicant